

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Formalities

The specification has been revised to correct various minor grammatical and idiomatic errors. Because the changes are all formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that the changes do not involve new matter.

2. Rejection of Claims 1 and 2 Under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph

This rejection has been addressed by:

- a. amending claim 1 to delete the phrase “such that,” although it is respectfully noted that “such **that**” as used in original claim 1 is not the same as “such **as**” referred to in MPEP §2173.05(d), cited in item 2 on page 2 of the Official Action; and
- b. amending claim 2 to clarify that the batteries of the multiple second wireless mobile devices recited in claim 2 (claim 1 recites that “at least one” second wireless mobile device can be cascaded with the first wireless mobile device, while claim 2 limits the number of second wireless mobile devices to more than one (“a plurality of”)).

Having thus overcome each of the grounds for rejection under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 thereunder is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of Claims 1-2 Under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128050 (Hong)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Hong publication does not disclose or suggest **cascading** of the **batteries** of multiple wireless communication devices, as claimed, so that the cascaded batteries in each of the first and second wireless devices can jointly (“**together**”) be used to power one of the communication devices during an emergency or critical

situation. The Hong publication discloses connection of two wireless devices (phone 100 and device 300 shown in Fig. 6, which may also be a phone) **so that one device powers the other**. This is not the same as cascading batteries so that the cascaded batteries **together** power one of the wireless devices.

According to Hong, battery 200 of phone 100 powers device 300. **When battery 200 is low, then neither device can be used.** The claimed invention avoids this problem by **cascading** the batteries, *i.e.*, **connecting the batteries in series** as illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2, so that one of the devices can be operated even when the battery in first device is weak. The Hong publication does not even consider the problem of operating device 300 (or phone 100) when the battery 200 in phone 100 is exhausted. In order to use the arrangement of Hong, the user must make sure battery 200 is charged, whereas the claimed invention is designed to address the problem of emergency use when the battery in the first device is exhausted by connecting one or more additional devices to provide a **power assist** to the battery of the first device.

With respect to claim 2, it is respectfully noted that since the battery 200 of phone 100 illustrated in Fig. 6 of Hong powers both phone 100 and device 300, adding more devices will only increase the load on battery 200. This is exactly **contrary** to the cascaded arrangement recited in claim 2, in which all of the cascaded device contribute to the supply of power, and therefore decrease the load on any one battery while increasing the chance that enough power will be available to power one of the devices during an emergency.

Because the Hong publication fails to disclose or suggest the claimed cascaded battery arrangement, it is respectfully submitted that the Hong publication does not anticipate either claim 1 or claim 2, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC §102(e) is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128050 (Hong) and U.S. Patent No. 6,643,527 (Satoh)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Satoh patent, like the Hong publication, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, the cascaded power-sharing battery arrangement of the claimed invention, much less one in which voltage stabilization is applied to the cascaded batteries are recited in claim 3.

The Satoh patent is directed to a power switching unit for a mobile phone that ensures a proper voltage supply, but does not include any arrangement for sharing power between multiple mobile phones. As a result, Satoh could not have suggested modification of the phone of Hong to include such an arrangement, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128050 (Hong) and U.S. Patent Nos. 6,643,527 (Satoh) and 3,749,946 (Von Ruti)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Von Ruti patent, like the Satoh patent and Hong publication, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, the cascaded power-sharing battery arrangement of the claimed invention, much less one in which a zener diode is used to provide voltage stabilization for the cascaded batteries as recited in claim 4.

The Von Ruti patent is directed to a microphone amplifier and has nothing to with sharing power between multiple mobile phones. As a result, neither Satoh nor Von Ruti could possibly have suggested modification of the phone of Hong to include such a cascaded power-sharing arrangement, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Serial Number 10/075,297

6. Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128050 (Hong) and U.S. Patent No. 5,177,426 (Nakanishi)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Nakanishi patent, like the Hong publication, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, the cascaded battery arrangement of the claimed invention, much less one in which a switch between the battery and load of a first device is opened upon connection of a second device to ensure that batteries in the first and second devices are cascaded rather than connected in parallel as recited in claim 5.

The Nakanishi patent is directed to an over-discharge protection circuit for a mobile phone, and does not include any arrangement for sharing power between multiple mobile phones. As a result, Nakanishi could not have suggested modification of the phone of Hong to include such an arrangement, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: August 2, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB\S\Producer\ben\Pending 1...PJULIN 075297u01.wpd